

REGULARIZED BAYESIAN BEST RESPONSE LEARNING IN FINITE GAMES

Sayan Mukherjee* and Souvik Roy†

November 21, 2021

Abstract

We introduce the notion of regularized Bayesian best response (RBBR) learning dynamic in heterogeneous population games. We obtain such a dynamic via perturbation by an arbitrary strongly convex regularizer in Bayesian population games with finitely many strategies. We provide a sufficient condition for the existence of rest points of the RBBR learning dynamic, and hence the existence of regularized Bayesian equilibrium in Bayesian population games. We also explore the fundamental properties of the RBBR learning dynamic, which includes the existence of unique continuous solutions from arbitrary initial conditions, as well as the continuity of the solution trajectories thus obtained with respect to the initial conditions. Finally, as an application we introduce the notions of Bayesian potential and Bayesian negative semidefinite games and provide convergence results for such games.

Keywords: Regularizer; Bayesian Strategies; Regularized Bayesian Best Response Learning Dynamic; Bayesian Potential Games, Bayesian Negative Semidefinite Games.

JEL classification: C72; C73.

arXiv:2111.13687v1 [math.OC] 25 Nov 2021

*Economic Research Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata. e-mail: sayanmukherjee012@gmail.com

†(Corresponding Author) Economic Research Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata. e-mail: souvik.2004@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

We introduce the notion of regularized Bayesian best response (RBBR) learning dynamic for a heterogeneous population, where the agents in the population are distributed over types taking values in a complete separable metric space. Similar to the standard best response, the Bayesian best response also seems to be the plausible behavioral norm in evolutionary game theory. However, due to the multiplicity of the Bayesian best response function, and the fact that it can vary abruptly, the behavioral protocol thus obtained is difficult to analyze. Thus we resort to a regularized version of the Bayesian best response in order to obtain a uniquely defined smoothed version of the Bayesian best response function, which can then be analyzed using the standard theory of ordinary differential equations. As a result, we obtain the RBBR learning dynamic, where the agents' payoffs are subject to perturbation by an arbitrary, but fixed strongly convex regularizer, and the agents best respond with respect to these perturbed payoffs. The logit dynamic (Fudenberg and Levine (1998)) is a prototypical example of evolutionary dynamics in population games with homogeneous payoff structure, where the agents' payoff are regularized using the well-known Shannon-Gibbs entropy. In our set-up, such a dynamic is called the logit RBBR learning dynamic. However, instead of assuming a particular form of the regularizer, RBBR learning dynamic is generated via perturbation by an arbitrary strongly convex regularizer, which includes the Tsallis entropy and the Burg entropy.¹

We now provide some motivations behind our study. Regularized best response dynamics are one of the most important classes of dynamics in the literature of evolutionary game theory. The logit dynamic is the most common and widely studied dynamic in evolutionary games. Since then several authors have extended the notion of logit dynamic to the class of more general perturbed best response dynamics as a means to study the social behavior of the underlying population (Benaim and Hirsch (1999), Hofbauer and Hopkins (2005), Hofbauer and Sandholm (2002), Hofbauer and Sandholm (2007)). To the best of our knowledge, regularized best response have been studied primarily in the context of homogeneous population games. This paper is an attempt to extend the notion of perturbed best response dynamics to the general class of Bayesian games. More formally, as opposed to population games with homogeneous payoff structure, we consider Bayesian population games, where the agents are distributed over types. The purpose of considering Bayesian games is that it is not quite likely for all agents in the population to have the same type.

For the purpose of our analysis, we consider a population where the agents are distributed over a metric space consisting of types, equipped with the usual Borel sigma-algebra, and a probability measure. Such a probability space is called the type space of the population. The state space of the RBBR learning dynamic is the space of Bayesian strategies, which are measurable maps from the type space to the space of all distributions over the strategies. However, the space of Bayesian strategies do not form a normed linear space. We therefore consider the normed linear space of integrable signed Bayesian strategies which are measurable maps from the type space onto \mathbb{R}^n . Following Ely and Sandholm (2005), we endow this space with the strong norm, which turns it into a Banach space. It then follows from the relevant literature (Diestel and Uhl Jr (1978)) that the space of signed Bayesian strategies is actually the Banach space of Böchner integrable functions.

We establish the existence of rest points of the RBBR learning dynamic, which are fixed points of the regularized Bayesian best response map, which we call regularized Bayesian equilibria. We also show that the solution trajectory to the RBBR dynamic is continuous for every given any initial condition. We further show that the solutions to the RBBR dynamic are continuous with respect to the initial states (that is, if we start from two initial states which are very close, then at every time point, the respective solutions to the RBBR dynamic will also be enough close). As applications of our results, we introduce the notions of Bayesian potential and Bayesian negative semidefinite games. Both these games are extensions of potential games and negative semidefinite games for homogeneous populations, respectively, for heterogeneous populations.²

Unlike evolutionary games with finitely many strategies, where the state space of the underlying dynamic is finite dimensional, the space of Bayesian strategies on which the RBBR learning dynamic is defined is an infinite dimensional Banach space. As a result, the evolutionary dynamics on the space of Bayesian strategies in a non trivial extension of the existing results on homogeneous population games with finite strategies. The choice of topology on the state space plays an important role in deriving the above mentioned results. For example, the weak topology on the space of signed Bayesian strategies turns out to be the appropriate topology to prove the result related to the existence of regularized Bayesian equilibrium. Whereas, on the other hand, the strong topology (induced by the strong norm) is necessary to show existence of solution trajectories to the RBBR learning dynamic. Establishing convergence in Bayesian potential games requires a further exercise of characterizing (strong) norm compact and forward invariant subsets of the space of signed Bayesian strategies in view of constructing a suitable Lyapunov function and applying relevant results from theory of dynamical systems.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains the preliminaries of the model. In Section 3, we first introduce the notion of a regularizer, followed by the definition of regularized Bayesian best response function, and the associated RBBR learning dynamic. We then establish the existence of rest points of the RBBR learning dynamic, in particular, the existence of regularized Bayesian equilibrium in the same section. In Section 4, we establish some fundamental properties of the RBBR learning dynamic subject to some conditions on the type space. We apply our results to Bayesian potential games and Bayesian semidefinite games in Section 5 and Section 6, respectively.

1.1 POSITIONING OF OUR PAPER IN THE LITERATURE

As far as we know, evolution in Bayesian games have not been explored much in the literature of evolutionary game theory. Such a theory of evolution in Bayesian games was first introduced by Ely and Sandholm (2005) in the view of studying the Bayesian best response dynamics where the agents in the population has diverse preferences. They showed that the equilibrium behavior of such a dynamic can be studied via the aggregation, though the

¹Both Tsallis and Burg entropy has appeared in the literature of (deterministically) perturbed best response dynamics, as well as in the context of online non-convex optimization problems. See Hofbauer and Sandholm (2002), and Héliou et al. (2020) for further details.

²See Monderer and Shapley (1996), Cheung (2014), Lahkar and Riedel (2015) for a complete exposition of potential and negative semidefinite games.

disequilibrium behavior of both the dynamics are quite dissimilar. They also show the equivalence stable states under the Bayesian best response dynamic and the aggregate dynamic. This paper was followed by [Sandholm et al. \(2007\)](#) which studies the evolutionary stability of purified equilibria of two-player normal form games under the Bayesian best response dynamic. [Staudigl \(2013\)](#) considers a network evolution model where players have diverse preferences and provides a closed-form expression for the invariant distribution of the underlying co-evolutionary process for potential games. [Zusai \(2018\)](#) considers evolutionary dynamics in heterogeneous populations obtained via a mean dynamic based on revision protocol function. They show that under some regularity conditions on the revision protocol function, the evolutionary dynamic admits a unique solution trajectory along with equilibrium stability in heterogeneous potential games.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Consider a population of continuum set of players whose mass is normalized to unity. Let $S := \{1, \dots, n\}$ denote the strategy space of the players in the population. Let $\Delta(S) := \{x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in [0, 1]^n : \sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} x_j = 1\}$ be the collection of all probability distributions on S . A probability distribution $x \in \Delta(S)$ denotes the state of the population. Thus, if we say that the state of the population is x , we mean that x_j proportion of players in the population are exercising strategy $j \in S$. The relative interior of $\Delta(S)$ is denoted by $\Delta(S)^\circ$.³

The standard literature of evolutionary games revolves around the fact that the population under consideration is homogeneous in the sense that each agent in the population is of the same type. In such a case, it is enough to study the evolutionary dynamics on the space of population distributions over the strategies, which we denoted by $\Delta(S)$. In other words, analyzing the aggregate behavior of the population under the underlying dynamics is sufficient to make predictions about the behavior of the population. [Ely and Sandholm \(2005\)](#) introduced the notion of heterogeneity within the population, where players in the population are distributed over types, and each type induces a certain belief (distribution) over the strategies. Let (Θ, d_Θ) be a complete separable metric space denoting the type space of the agents in the population. Let $\mathcal{B}(\Theta)$ denote the Borel sigma-algebra on Θ and let ξ be a probability measure on Θ . The probability space $(\Theta, \mathcal{B}(\Theta), \xi)$ is called the *type space of the population*. For notational simplicity, we will use the notation (Θ, ξ) to denote the type space. Since ξ is a probability measure over the types, we will sometimes refer to ξ as the type measure.

Definition 2.1 (Bayesian strategy). A Bayesian strategy is a ξ -measurable mapping $\sigma : \Theta \rightarrow \Delta(S)$.⁴

In other words, a Bayesian strategy maps every type to a belief/distribution over the strategy space S . We say that two Bayesian strategies σ and ρ are equivalent and write $\sigma \sim \rho$ if $\sigma(\theta) = \rho(\theta)$, ξ -a.s. We denote the equivalence classes of all Bayesian strategies by Σ/\sim . We conclude this section with the definition of Bayesian population games and a related example on Bayesian aggregative population games.

Definition 2.2 (Bayesian population game). A Bayesian population game is a map $\mathcal{G} : \Sigma \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that for every $\sigma \in \Sigma$, the mapping

$$\theta \mapsto \mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta) \quad \text{is } \mathcal{B}(\Theta)/\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ measurable.}$$

Here, for a Bayesian strategy $\sigma \in \Sigma$, $\mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta)$ denotes the payoff vector of the players in the population of type $\theta \in \Theta$.

Example 2.1 (Bayesian aggregative population games, [Ely and Sandholm \(2005\)](#)). Suppose that the type space of the agents in the population is the collection of continuous maps from $\Delta(S)$ to \mathbb{R}^n . In other words,

$$\Theta := \left\{ \theta : \Delta(S) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n : \theta \text{ is continuous} \right\}. \quad (1)$$

The space Θ is endowed with the sup-norm metric, that is $d_\Theta(\theta, \bar{\theta}) := \sup_{x \in \Delta(S)} \|\theta(x) - \bar{\theta}(x)\|$ for all $\theta, \bar{\theta} \in \Theta$, in which case it is a complete and separable metric space. Let (Θ, ξ) denote the type space of the population. Note that from the standard theory of evolutionary games, the elements of θ are population games. More precisely, players of type $\theta \in \Theta$, exercising strategy $j \in S$ at population state $x \in \Delta(S)$, receives payoff $\theta_j(x)$. The expectation operator is a mapping $\mathcal{E} : \Sigma \rightarrow \Delta(S)$ such that for every $\sigma \in \Sigma$,

$$\mathcal{E}^i(\sigma) := \int_{\Theta} \sigma^i(\theta) \xi(d\theta), \quad \text{for all } i \in S.⁵$$

Given $\sigma \in \Sigma$, $\mathcal{E}(\sigma)$ denotes the aggregate belief of the population over the strategies. Following [Ely and Sandholm \(2005\)](#), the mapping $\mathcal{G} : \Sigma \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that for every $\sigma \in \Sigma$,

$$\mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta) := \theta(\mathcal{E}(\sigma)), \quad \text{for all } \theta \in \Theta$$

is called a Bayesian aggregative population game. Note that for every $\sigma \in \Sigma$, the mapping $\theta \mapsto \theta(\mathcal{E}(\sigma))$ is continuous, and hence measurable.

³The relative interior is defined with respect to the standard Euclidian topology on \mathbb{R}^n .

⁴See Appendix A.1.

⁵Since the Bayesian strategies take values in the compact set $\Delta(S)$, the expectation operator \mathcal{E} is well-defined.

3. REGULARIZED BAYESIAN BEST RESPONSE AND REGULARIZED BAYESIAN EQUILIBRIA

In this section we seek to define the notion of regularized Bayesian best response learning dynamic, which in turn requires us to define the notion of regularized Bayesian best response map. To this end we have the following definition.

Consider the type space (Θ, ξ) . The *Bayesian best response correspondence* is a mapping $\beta : \Sigma \implies \Sigma$ such that for all $\sigma \in \Sigma$,

$$\beta[\sigma](\theta) := \arg \max_{\mathbf{y} \in \Delta(S)} \langle \mathbf{y}, \mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta) \rangle, \quad \text{for all } \theta \in \Theta.$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the usual inner product on \mathbb{R}^n . The fact that the Bayesian best response is a multi-valued mapping requires us to define regularized version of the Bayesian best response correspondence. For this, we require the notion of a regularizer, which we state in the following definition.

Definition 3.1 (Regularizer). A mapping $v : \Delta(S) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ is called a regularizer on $\Delta(S)$ if it is finite except possibly on the relative boundary $\partial\Delta(S)$ of $\Delta(S)$; smooth and strongly convex on $\Delta(S)^\circ$; and $\|\nabla v(\mathbf{x}_n)\| \rightarrow \infty$ as $\mathbf{x}_n \rightarrow \partial\Delta(S)$.^{6,7}

It is well-known (evident as well) that regularization ensures the (almost sure) existence of a unique best response. We now provide some examples of widely used regularizers which have been extensively used in the literature of evolution and learning in games, both in the context of finite strategy games and infinite strategy games. They have also been used extensively in reinforcement learning and online non-convex optimization problems.

Example 3.1. The most commonly used regularizers are the Shannon entropy, the Tsallis entropy and the Burg entropy. They are presented below.

- **Shannon-Gibbs entropy:** $v(\mathbf{x}) := -\sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} x_j \log x_j$, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \Delta(S)$.
- **Tsallis entropy:** $v(\mathbf{x}) := (1 - \gamma)^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} (x_j - x_j^\gamma)$, for $0 < \gamma < 1$, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \Delta(S)$.
- **Burg entropy:** $v(\mathbf{x}) := -\sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} \log x_j$, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \Delta(S)$.

We now proceed to define the regularized Bayesian best response mapping with respect to an arbitrary but fixed regularizer v . Given a noise parameter $\varepsilon > 0$, the *regularized Bayesian best response* (RBBR) is a mapping $\beta_\varepsilon : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ such that for every $\sigma \in \Sigma$,

$$\beta_\varepsilon[\sigma](\theta) := \arg \max_{\mathbf{y} \in \Delta(S)} \langle \mathbf{y}, \mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta) \rangle - \varepsilon v(\mathbf{y}), \quad \text{for all } \theta \in \Theta.⁸ \quad (2)$$

The purpose behind defining the regularized version of the Bayesian best response correspondence is to ensure the existence of a unique maximizer in (2), when the expected payoff is perturbed via the regularizer v .

Proposition 3.1. For every $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma$, the mapping $\sigma \mapsto \beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)$ is well-defined, that is, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma$, $\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)$ is ξ -measurable.

The proof of Proposition 3.1 is relegated to Appendix A.2.

When the regularized Bayesian best response is obtained through a perturbation by the Shannon-Gibbs entropy, we generate the *logit Bayesian best response* $l^\varepsilon : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ defined as: for every $\sigma \in \Sigma$,

$$l_j^\varepsilon[\sigma](\theta) = \frac{\exp(\varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{G}_j(\sigma, \theta))}{\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \exp(\varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{G}_i(\sigma, \theta))}, \quad \text{for all } \theta \in \Theta, \text{ and all } j \in \{1, \dots, n\}.$$

The space of *integrable signed Bayesian strategies* from the type space Θ to \mathbb{R}^n is defined as

$$\widehat{\Sigma} := \left\{ \widehat{\sigma} : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n : \int_{\Theta} \|\widehat{\sigma}(\theta)\| \xi(d\theta) < \infty \right\}. \quad (3)$$

In words, we identify the space of integrable signed Bayesian strategies by the Bochner space $\mathcal{L}^1(\Theta, \xi, \mathbb{R}^n)$.⁹ Following Ely and Sandholm (2005), we endow $\widehat{\Sigma}$ with the strong topology, which is based on the norm $\|\cdot\| : \widehat{\Sigma} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\|\widehat{\sigma}\| := \int_{\Theta} \|\widehat{\sigma}(\theta)\| \xi(d\theta), \quad \text{for all } \widehat{\sigma} \in \widehat{\Sigma}.$$

We now review the notions of continuity and differentiability of trajectories through the space $(\widehat{\Sigma}, \|\cdot\|)$. Let $(\widehat{\sigma}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a trajectory through $\widehat{\Sigma}$. An integrable signed Bayesian strategy $\widehat{\sigma} \in \widehat{\Sigma}$ is a *strong limit* of $(\widehat{\sigma}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ as t

⁶A mapping $f : \Delta(S) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is smooth on $\Delta(S)^\circ$ if f is infinitely times differentiable on $\Delta(S)^\circ$.

⁷Let $\gamma > 0$. A mapping $f : \Delta(S) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is γ -strongly convex on $\Delta(S)^\circ$ if

$$v(\alpha \mathbf{x} + (1 - \alpha) \mathbf{y}) \leq \alpha v(\mathbf{x}) + (1 - \alpha) v(\mathbf{y}) - \frac{\gamma \alpha (1 - \alpha)}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2,$$

for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \Delta(S)^\circ$, $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$.

⁸The fact that the perturbation function v is strongly convex implies that for every fixed $\sigma \in \Sigma$, the mapping $\mathbf{y} \mapsto \langle \mathbf{y}, \mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta) \rangle - \varepsilon v(\mathbf{y})$ has a unique maximum.

⁹See Appendix A.1.

approaches t_0 if $\lim_{t \rightarrow t_0} \|\hat{\sigma}_t - \hat{\sigma}\| = 0$. The trajectory $(\hat{\sigma}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is *continuous* at time t if $\lim_{s \rightarrow t} \|\hat{\sigma}_s - \hat{\sigma}_t\| = 0$. We say that the trajectory $(\hat{\sigma}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is continuous if it is continuous at every $t \geq 0$. The trajectory $(\hat{\sigma}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is *differentiable* if for every $t \geq 0$, there exists $\hat{\sigma}_t \in \hat{\Sigma}$ such that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\| \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{t+\varepsilon} - \hat{\sigma}_t}{\varepsilon} - \dot{\hat{\sigma}}_t \right\| = 0.^{10}$$

The notion of continuity and differentiability of solution trajectories introduced above plays an important role in the definition of regularized Bayesian best response learning dynamic. We precisely state this in the following definition.

Definition 3.2 (Regularized Bayesian best response learning). *Consider the type space (Θ, ξ) . Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be a noise parameter and let the RBBR map be as defined in (2). Then the regularized Bayesian best response learning dynamic is defined as*

$$\dot{\sigma} = \beta_\varepsilon(\sigma) - \sigma. \quad (4)$$

From Definition 3.2, it follows that under the RBBR learning dynamic, a Bayesian strategy σ moves towards its regularized Bayesian best response $\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)$. A rest point of the RBBR learning dynamic is a Bayesian strategy σ° satisfying $\dot{\sigma}^\circ \equiv 0$. Thus any rest point of the dynamic (2) is a Bayesian strategy σ° satisfies $\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma^\circ) = \sigma^\circ$, and hence becomes a fixed point of the regularized Bayesian best response map. Such a fixed point is called a *regularized Bayesian equilibrium*.

Let $\text{RBE}(\xi; \varepsilon)$ be the collection of all regularized Bayesian equilibrium with noise parameter ε under type measure ξ , that is, $\text{RBE}(\xi; \varepsilon) := \{\sigma^\circ \in \Sigma : \beta_\varepsilon(\sigma^\circ) = \sigma^\circ\}$. The main result of this section shows that the regularized Bayesian equilibrium exists for every $\varepsilon > 0$ under some conditions on the game \mathcal{G} . We prove this by applying Brouwer-Schauder-Tychonoff fixed point theorem (see Aliprantis and Border (2013) for details). In order to apply the aforementioned fixed point theorem in the context of the existence of regularized Bayesian equilibrium, we require the notion of an appropriate topology on the space of Bayesian strategies, which essentially is the weak topology in this case.¹¹

Definition 3.3. Let $(\Theta, \mathcal{B}(\Theta), \xi)$ be the type space of the population, and let $\hat{\Sigma}$ be the space of integrable signed Bayesian strategies. Then weak topology on $\hat{\Sigma}$ is the topology induced by the convergence:

$$\hat{\sigma}_n \rightarrow^w \hat{\sigma} \text{ if and only if } \int_{\Theta} \langle \hat{\sigma}_n, \hat{\rho} \rangle(\theta) \xi(d\theta) \rightarrow \int_{\Theta} \langle \hat{\sigma}, \hat{\rho} \rangle(\theta) \xi(d\theta), \text{ for all } \hat{\rho} \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(\Theta, \xi, \mathbb{R}^{n*}).$$

We show the existence of regularized Bayesian equilibrium when the space of Bayesian strategies Σ is endowed with the weak topology. To state our desired theorem, we require the following definition.

Definition 3.4 (Weakly continuous Bayesian population game). *A Bayesian population game $\mathcal{G} : \Sigma \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be weakly continuous if the map $\sigma \mapsto \mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta)$ is continuous relative to the weak topology on Σ , for ξ -a.e. $\theta \in \Theta$.*

With the above definition of continuous Bayesian population games, we now proceed to state the main theorem of this section which provides a sufficient condition for the existence of regularized Bayesian equilibrium.

Theorem 3.1. *Consider the type space (Θ, ξ) . Suppose that the Bayesian population game $\mathcal{G} : \Sigma \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is weakly continuous. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$, the RBBR mapping $\sigma \mapsto \beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)$ admits a fixed point, that is, there exists $\sigma_\varepsilon^\circ \in \Sigma$ such that $\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma_\varepsilon^\circ) = \sigma_\varepsilon^\circ$.*

The proof of Theorem 3.1 is relegated to Appendix A.3; here we provide a brief sketch of the same. We prove the theorem in two steps. First, we show that under the weak topology, the space of Bayesian strategies Σ is compact (Lemma A.1). We show this by applying Dunford-Pettis theorem (see Diestel and Uhl Jr (1978) for details) which characterizes the relatively compact subsets of Böchner spaces under the weak topology. Then, we show that the mapping $\sigma \mapsto \beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)$ is continuous with respect to the weak topology on Σ . As a result, by applying the Brouwer-Schauder-Tychonoff fixed point theorem (Aliprantis and Border (2013)) we conclude the existence of a fixed point of the map β_ε .

As a corollary to the above theorem, we have the following result which states the existence of regularized equilibrium in Bayesian aggregative population games.

Corollary 3.1. *Consider the type space $(\mathcal{C}(\Delta; \mathbb{R}^n), \xi)$. Let $\mathcal{G} : \Sigma \times \mathcal{C}(\Delta; \mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a Bayesian aggregative population game as defined in Example 2.1. Then for every noise parameter $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a regularized Bayesian equilibrium.*

The proof of Corollary 3.1 is relegated to Appendix A.4.

We also obtain the following corollary of Theorem 3.1 which states that if the type measure is concentrated on populations games which are obtained via random matching in matrix games, then the conditions of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied and hence a fixed point of β_ε , ensuring the existence of regularized Bayesian equilibrium. We need some notations to present this result. Let $\mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$ be the collection of all $n \times n$ matrices with real entries and let $F \subseteq \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$ be compact.¹² Define the following subset of Θ :

¹⁰See Ely and Sandholm (2005) for further details.

¹¹Recall from Lahkar and Riedel (2015), that the existence of logit equilibrium for games on continuum strategy spaces was also established when the underlying topology was the weak topology.

¹²Compact subsets of $\mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$ can be obtained via compact subsets of \mathbb{R}^{n^2} .

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{mat}}^F(\Delta; \mathbb{R}^n) := \left\{ \theta \in \Theta : \text{there exists } A \subseteq F \text{ such that } \theta(\mathbf{x}) = A\mathbf{x} \text{ for all } \mathbf{x} \in \Delta(S) \right\}. \quad (5)$$

Since matrix games are special cases of Bayesian aggregate population games, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 3.2. *The following statements hold true:*

- (i) *The set $\mathcal{C}_{\text{mat}}^F(\Delta; \mathbb{R}^n)$ has compact closure in $\mathcal{C}(\Delta; \mathbb{R}^n)$.*
- (ii) *If $\xi(\text{closure}[\mathcal{C}_{\text{mat}}^F(\Delta; \mathbb{R}^n)]) = 1$, then for every $\varepsilon > 0$, the RBBR map admits a fixed point.*

The proof of the corollary is relegated to Appendix A.5.

4. FUNDAMENTAL PROPERTIES OF REGULARIZED BAYESIAN BEST RESPONSE LEARNING DYNAMIC

In this section, we establish two fundamental properties of the regularized Bayesian best response dynamic, namely, the existence of solutions from an arbitrary initial condition in Σ and continuity of these solutions with respect to the initial states. We resort to the infinite dimensional Picard-Lindelöf theorem and the Grönwall's inequality (see Zeidler (1986)) in order to prove the main results of this section. We begin with the following two definitions.

Definition 4.1 (Strongly Lipschitz BPG). *A Bayesian population game $\mathcal{G} : \Sigma \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be strongly Lipschitz if there exists $\kappa > 0$ such that for ξ -a.e $\theta \in \Theta$,*

$$\|\mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta) - \mathcal{G}(\rho, \theta)\| \leq \kappa \|\sigma - \rho\|, \quad \text{for all } \sigma, \rho \in \Sigma.$$

Definition 4.2 (Semiflow of a dynamic). *Consider an abstract differential equation*

$$\phi'(t) = \Lambda(\phi(t))$$

on a Banach space $(\mathcal{X}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{X}})$. Suppose that a unique solution to the above differential equation exists for every initial condition $\phi(0) = \gamma$ and denote the solution with initial condition γ by $\phi_{\gamma}(t)$. Then the semiflow of the dynamic is the map $\zeta : \mathcal{X} \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ defined as $\zeta(\gamma, t) = \phi_{\gamma}(t)$ for all $\gamma \in \mathcal{X}$ and $t \in [0, \infty)$.

We now state the main theorem on the existence of solutions to the RBBR dynamic.

Theorem 4.1. *Consider the type space (Θ, ξ) . Suppose that the Bayesian population game $\mathcal{G} : \Sigma \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is strongly locally Lipschitz. Then the following statements hold true:*

- (i) *For every initial condition $\sigma_0 \in \Sigma$, the RBBR dynamic admits a unique solution $(\sigma_t)_{t \geq 0}$.*
- (ii) *The semiflow $\zeta : \widehat{\Sigma} \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow \widehat{\Sigma}$ of the RBBR dynamic is continuous in the initial conditions with respect to the strong topology on $\widehat{\Sigma}$.*

The proof Theorem 4.1 is relegated to Appendix A.7. We now state the corollary which guarantees the existence of solution to the RBBR dynamic for Bayesian aggregate population games; and also in particular, for Bayesian matrix games. To this end, we will require the notion of a Lipschitz population game.

Definition 4.3. A population game $\theta : \Delta(S) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be Lipschitz if there exists a real number $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$\|\theta(\mathbf{x}) - \theta(\mathbf{y})\| \leq \alpha \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|, \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \Delta(S).$$

For $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, let $\text{Lip}_{\alpha}(\Delta; K)$ be the collection of α -Lipschitz population games which map $\Delta(S)$ into K .

Corollary 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{G} : \Sigma \times \mathcal{C}(\Delta; \mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a Bayesian aggregate population game. Then the following statements are true:*

- (i) *For every $\alpha > 0$ and $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ compact, the set $\text{Lip}_{\alpha}(\Delta; K)$ has compact closure in $\mathcal{C}(\Delta; \mathbb{R}^n)$.*
- (ii) *Suppose that there exists $\alpha > 0$ and $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ compact such that $\xi(\text{closure}(\text{Lip}_{\alpha}(\Delta; K))) = 1$. Then the conclusions of Theorem 4.1 hold true.*

The proof of Corollary 4.1 is relegated to Appendix A.6. Since Bayesian matrix games are special forms of aggregative Bayesian population games, we also have the following corollary.

Corollary 4.2. *Let $\mathcal{G} : \Sigma \times \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a Bayesian matrix population game. Suppose that there exists $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ compact such that $\xi(\text{closure}[\mathcal{C}_{\text{mat}}^F(\Delta; \mathbb{R}^n)]) = 1$. Then the conclusions of Theorem 4.1 hold true.*

5. CONVERGENCE IN BAYESIAN POTENTIAL GAMES

In this section we define the notion of Bayesian potential games and study the convergence of the RBBR dynamic to the regularized Bayesian equilibria in such games.¹³ For this purpose, we first require the notion of Fréchet derivative, which is a generalization of the usual derivative in Banach spaces. Let \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{W} be normed linear spaces. An operator $\phi : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$ is Fréchet differentiable at $x \in \mathcal{V}$ if there exists a bounded linear operator $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$ such that

$$\lim_{\|h\|_{\mathcal{V}} \rightarrow 0} \frac{\|\phi(x+h) - \phi(x) - \mathcal{A}h\|_{\mathcal{W}}}{\|h\|_{\mathcal{V}}} = 0.$$

Thus, if \mathcal{A} is the Fréchet derivative of ϕ , then $\phi(x+h) = \phi(x) + \mathcal{A}h + \mathbf{o}(\|h\|_{\mathcal{V}})$ for all h near zero in \mathcal{V} .

In this paper, we consider Fréchet differentiability of functions $\phi : \widehat{\Sigma} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The Fréchet derivative of ϕ is denoted by $D\phi$. Let \mathbb{R}_0^n be the collection of n -dimensional vectors such that that sum of the components is zero, that is, $\mathbb{R}_0^n := \{x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_1 + \dots + x_n = 0\}$. Let $\Sigma_0 := \{\widehat{\sigma} \in \widehat{\Sigma} : \widehat{\sigma}(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}_0^n \text{ for all } \theta \in \Theta\}$. Let $\phi : \widehat{\Sigma} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Fréchet differentiable mapping. Then the *Fréchet gradient* $\nabla^F \phi : \widehat{\Sigma} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^\infty(\Theta, \xi, \mathbb{R}^{n*})$ of ϕ is a bounded measurable map defined as follows: for every $\widehat{\sigma} \in \widehat{\Sigma}$ and every $\sigma_0 \in \Sigma_0$,

$$D\phi[\widehat{\sigma}](\sigma_0) := \int_{\Theta} \langle \sigma_0, \nabla^F \phi(\widehat{\sigma}) \rangle(\theta) \xi(d\theta) = \int_{\Theta} \nabla^F \phi[\widehat{\sigma}](\theta)(\sigma_0(\theta)) \xi(d\theta). \quad (6)$$

We now proceed to define the notion of a Bayesian potential game.

Definition 5.1 (Bayesian Potential Games). *A mapping $\mathcal{G} : \Sigma \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is called a Bayesian potential game if there exists a Fréchet differentiable map $\varphi : \widehat{\Sigma} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for every $\sigma \in \Sigma$, we have*

$$\nabla^F \varphi[\sigma](\theta) = \mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta), \quad \xi - a.s.$$

The map φ is called the Bayesian potential function of the Bayesian potential game \mathcal{G} .

In order to prove convergence results pertaining to Bayesian potential games, we first define a subset of the space of Bayesian strategies as follows. Let $M \subseteq \Delta(S)^\circ$ be a compact set. Define

$$\Sigma_M := \{\sigma \in \Sigma : \sigma(\theta) \in M \text{ for } \xi - a.e. \theta \in \Theta\}. \quad (7)$$

In words, Σ_M is the collection of those Bayesian strategies such that for almost all types $\theta \in \Theta$, the induced belief over the actions is bounded away from the boundary of the simplex $\Delta(S)$. As a result the induced belief assigns a positive probability to each action in S . We now introduce the notion of *entropy adjusted Bayesian potential function* which is a map $\widehat{v} : \Sigma_M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as

$$\widehat{v}(\sigma) := \int_{\Theta} v(\sigma(\theta)) \xi(d\theta), \quad \text{for all } \sigma \in \Sigma_M.$$

The fact that the regularizer v is smooth on $\Delta(S)^\circ$ implies that \widehat{v} is well defined. This leads us to the following important definition.

Definition 5.2 (Entropy adjusted Bayesian potential function). *For $M \subseteq \Delta(S)^\circ$ compact, the entropy adjusted Bayesian potential function is a mapping $\widetilde{\varphi} : \Sigma_M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as*

$$\widetilde{\varphi}(\sigma) = \varphi(\sigma) - \widehat{v}(\sigma), \quad \text{for all } \sigma \in \Sigma_M.$$

In order to state and prove convergence results related to Bayesian potential and Bayesian negative semidefinite games, we need to focus on norm-compact subsets of the space of Bayesian strategies which are forward invariant under the RBBR dynamic. We provide a sufficient condition to identify such subsets on which the the solution trajectories of the RBBR dynamic can lead to nice convergence results. To this end, we require the following definition, that of a Lipschitz Bayesian strategy.

Definition 5.3 (Lipschitz Bayesian strategy). *A Bayesian strategy $\sigma : \Theta \rightarrow \Delta(S)$ is said to be Lipschitz if there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that*

$$\|\sigma(\theta) - \sigma(\bar{\theta})\| \leq \alpha d_{\Theta}(\theta, \bar{\theta}), \quad \text{for all } \theta, \bar{\theta} \in \Theta.$$

To present the main result on convergence in Bayesian potential games, we restrict to the following subset of Bayesian strategies. Fix $\alpha > 0$, $M \subseteq \Delta(S)^\circ$ compact, and $\Xi \subseteq \Theta$. Define

$$\Sigma_M^\alpha[\Xi] := \{\sigma \in \Sigma : \sigma \text{ is } \alpha\text{-Lipschitz on } \Xi\} \cap \Sigma_M. \quad (8)$$

In words, $\Sigma_M^\alpha[\Xi]$ is the collection of Bayesian strategies which are α -Lipschitz on the subset Ξ with range ξ -a.s. contained in the compact set M . In the following lemma, we show that $\Sigma_M^\alpha[\Xi]$ is relatively norm compact subject to suitable conditions on the type measure ξ . We also show that $\Sigma_M^\alpha[\Xi]$ is forward invariant under the RBBR dynamic under some further conditions on the Lipschitz coefficient. As a result, the lemma provides a candidate space to

¹³See [Monderer and Shapley \(1996\)](#), [Sandholm \(2010\)](#), and [Lahkar and Riedel \(2015\)](#) for a complete exposition of potential games.

prove convergence results for Bayesian potential games and Bayesian negative semidefinite games. The following theorem (Theorem 5.1) provides a sufficient condition on a collection of Bayesian strategies to be norm compact and forward invariant under the RBBR learning dynamic.

Theorem 5.1 (Norm compactness and forward invariance). *Let $\gamma, \varepsilon > 0$ and $M \subseteq \Delta(S)^\circ$ compact. Let v be a γ -strongly convex regularizer as defined in (3.1). Suppose that there exists a compact set $\Xi \subseteq \Theta$ such that $\xi(\Xi) = 1$. For $\alpha > 0$, let $\Sigma_M^\alpha[\Xi]$ is the collection of Bayesian strategies that are uniformly α -Lipschitz on Ξ . Then the following statements hold true:*

- (i) *The subset $\Sigma_M^\alpha[\Xi]$ is relatively norm compact in $\widehat{\Sigma}$.*
- (ii) *If $\alpha \geq \frac{1}{\varepsilon\gamma}$, then the subset $\Sigma_M^\alpha[\Xi]$ is forward invariant under the RBBR learning dynamic.*

The proof of Theorem 5.1 is relegated to Appendix A.8.

The fact that $\Sigma_M^\alpha[\Xi]$ is relatively norm compact and forward invariant under the RBBR learning dynamic will allow us to use results from the theory of dynamical systems to prove the desired convergence of the solutions to the regularized Bayesian best response learning dynamic to the regularized Bayesian equilibrium. In what follows, we present the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 5.2. *Suppose that the assumptions of Theorem 5.1 are satisfied. Let $\mathcal{G} : \Sigma \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a Bayesian potential game with Bayesian potential function $\varphi : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and let $\widetilde{\varphi}_M^\alpha : \Sigma_M^\alpha[\Xi] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the entropy adjusted Bayesian potential function restricted to Σ_α . Then the following statements hold true:*

- (i) *$\widetilde{\varphi}_M^\alpha$ increases weakly along every solution trajectory to RBBR learning dynamic that originates in $\Sigma_M^\alpha[\Xi]$ and increases strictly across every non-stationary solution trajectory.*
- (ii) *The set of omega-limit points (in the strong topology on Σ_α) of any trajectory to the RBBR learning dynamic is a non-empty connected compact set of perturbed Bayesian equilibria. Moreover, such limit points are local maximizers of the entropy adjusted Bayesian potential function $\widetilde{\varphi}_M^\alpha$ on $\Sigma_M^\alpha[\Xi]$.*

The proof of Theorem 5.2 is relegated to Appendix A.9.

6. CONVERGENCE IN BAYESIAN NEGATIVE SEMIDEFINITE GAMES

In this section we define the notion of Bayesian negative semidefinite games, which is a generalization of negative semidefinite population games on finite strategy spaces. We also generalize the notion of self defeating externalities to Bayesian self defeating externalities. Following Cheung (2014), we show the equivalence between Bayesian negative semidefinite games and Bayesian self defeating externalities. Finally, we conclude the section by proving a convergence result which shows that the solution to the RBBR learning dynamic with initial condition in any norm compact forward invariant subset of Σ converges to the regularized Bayesian equilibrium under the strong topology on Σ , when the underlying game is a Bayesian negative semidefinite game.

Definition 6.1 (Bayesian negative semidefinite games). *Let (Θ, d_Θ) be the type space of the population. A mapping $\mathcal{G} : \Sigma \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is called a Bayesian negative semidefinite game if*

$$\int_{\Theta} \langle \mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta) - \mathcal{G}(\rho, \theta), \sigma(\theta) - \rho(\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta) \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } \sigma, \rho \in \widehat{\Sigma}.$$

For a fixed $\theta \in \Theta$, the slice map $\mathcal{G}_\theta : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is defined as $\mathcal{G}_\theta(\sigma) := \mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta)$, for all $\sigma \in \Sigma$. This definition is required in the notion of Bayesian self defeating externalities. We provide the definition below.

Definition 6.2 (Bayesian self defeating externalities). *A Bayesian population game $\mathcal{G} : \Sigma \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies Bayesian self defeating externalities if the following two conditions are satisfied:*

- (i) *For every $\theta \in \Theta$, the slice map $\mathcal{G}_\theta : \widehat{\Sigma} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is C^1 -Fréchet differentiable for ξ -a.e $\theta \in \Theta$, and*
- (ii) *$\int_{\Theta} \langle D\mathcal{G}_\theta[\sigma](\sigma_0), \sigma_0(\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta) \leq 0$, for all $\sigma \in \Sigma$, and all $\sigma_0 \in \Sigma_0$.*

Cheung (2014) proved that the notion of negative semidefiniteness and the notion of self defeating externalities are equivalent in the context of population games. Our next lemma says that the same holds in the case of Bayesian population games also.

Lemma 6.1. *A Bayesian population game $\mathcal{G} : \Sigma \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is Bayesian negative semidefinite if and only if it satisfies Bayesian self defeating externalities.*

The proof of Lemma 6.1 is relegated to Appendix A.10.

Now, we proceed to study the convergence of Bayesian negative semidefinite games under the RBBR dynamic. To do so we again restrict the dynamic to the norm compact forward invariant subset $\Sigma_M^\alpha[\Xi]$ as defined in Section 5. On this restricted space we define the appropriate Lyapunov function as a mapping $\psi_{M,\varepsilon}^\alpha : \Sigma_M^\alpha[\Xi] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\psi_\varepsilon(\sigma) := \left[\int_{\Theta} \langle \mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta), \beta_\varepsilon[\sigma](\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta) - \widehat{v}_\varepsilon(\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)) \right] - \left[\int_{\Theta} \langle \mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta), \sigma(\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta) - \widehat{v}_\varepsilon(\sigma) \right]. \quad (9)$$

Theorem 6.1. Let $\mathcal{G} : \Sigma \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a Bayesian negative semidefinite game such that the slice map \mathcal{G}_θ is C^1 -Fréchet differentiable in the norm topology for ξ -a.e $\theta \in \Theta$. For $\alpha > 0$, $M \subseteq \Delta(S)^\circ$ compact, and $\Gamma \subseteq \Theta$ compact, let $\Sigma_M^\alpha[\Xi]$ be as defined in 5.1. Then, the Lyapounov function $\psi_{M,\varepsilon}^\alpha : \Sigma_M^\alpha[\Xi] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as defined in (9) decreases monotonically to zero along every solution trajectory to the RBBR learning dynamic that originates in $\Sigma_M^\alpha[\Xi]$, and decreases strictly along every non stationary solutions. Hence, every solution trajectory to the RBBR learning dynamic in $\Sigma_M^\alpha[\Xi]$ converges with respect to the norm topology on $\Sigma_M^\alpha[\Xi]$ to the regularized Bayesian equilibrium.

The proof of Theorem 6.1 is relegated to Appendix A.11.

A. APPENDIX

A.1 PRELIMINARIES OF BÖCHNER SPACES

In this section, we provide a brief exposition on the preliminary theory of Böchner spaces which we use in our proofs.

Definition A.1. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ be a probability space and let \mathcal{X} be a Banach space. A function $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is simple if there exists $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k \in \mathcal{X}$ and $E_1, E_2, \dots, E_k \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $f(\omega) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} x_i \chi_{E_i}(\omega)$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$, where χ_{E_i} denotes the indicator function on E_i for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$.

Definition A.2. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ be a probability space and let \mathcal{X} be a Banach space. A function $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is μ -measurable if there exists a sequence of simple functions $(f_n)_{n \geq 1}$ with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_n - f\|_{\mathcal{X}} = 0$, μ -almost everywhere.

Definition A.3. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ be a probability space and let \mathcal{X} be a Banach space. A function $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is weakly μ -measurable if for every $x^* \in \mathcal{X}^*$, the numerical function $x^* f$ is μ -measurable.

Let $\mathcal{L}^p(\Omega, \mu, \mathcal{X})$ denote the space of all (μ -a.s.) equivalence classes of Böchner integrable functions $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ with norm defined as

$$\|f\| := \int_{\Omega} \|f(\omega)\|_{\mathcal{X}}^p \mu(d\omega) < \infty.$$

The the Böchner space $\mathcal{L}^p(\Omega, \mu, \mathcal{X})$ is a generalization of standard $\mathcal{L}^p(\mu)$ spaces.¹⁴ Note that the space of integrable signed Bayesian strategies as defined in (3) can be viewed as the Böchner space $\mathcal{L}^1(\Omega, \mu, \mathcal{X})$, where $\Omega = \Theta$, $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}(\Theta)$, $\mu = \xi$, and $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^n$.

We now introduce the notion of weak topology on $\mathcal{L}^p(\Omega, \mu, \mathcal{X})$ for $1 \leq p < \infty$. Let $f \in \mathcal{L}^p(\Omega, \mu, \mathcal{X})$ and $g \in \mathcal{L}^q(\Omega, \mu, \mathcal{X}^*)$, where $p^{-1} + q^{-1} = 1$.¹⁵ Define $\langle f, g \rangle(\omega) := g(\omega)(f(\omega))$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$.¹⁶

Definition A.4. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ be a probability space and let \mathcal{X} be a Banach space. The weak topology on $\mathcal{L}^p(\Omega, \mu, \mathcal{X})$ is the topology induced by the convergence:

$$f_n \rightarrow^w f \iff \int_{\Omega} \langle f_n, g \rangle(\omega) \mu(d\omega) \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} \langle f, g \rangle(\omega) \mu(d\omega), \quad \text{for all } g \in \mathcal{L}^q(\Omega, \mu, \mathcal{X}^*).$$

The following three definitions are required in the context of Theorem 5.1.

Definition A.5. Let $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(\Omega, \mu, \mathcal{X})$ and $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Then the average value of f over A is defined as

$$\text{avg}(f; A) := \frac{1}{\mu(A)} \int_A f(\omega) \mu(d\omega).$$

Definition A.6. Let $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(\Omega, \mu, \mathcal{X})$ and $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Then the Bocce oscillation of f over A is defined as

$$\text{Bocce-osc}(f; A) := \frac{1}{\mu(A)} \int_A \|f(\omega) - \text{avg}(f; A)\|_{\mathcal{X}} \mu(d\omega).$$

Definition A.7. A subset \mathcal{H} of $\mathcal{L}^1(\Omega, \mu, \mathcal{X})$ is said to satisfy small Bocce oscillation if for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a finite measurable partition $\{A_1, \dots, A_p\} \subseteq \Omega$ such that for all $f \in \mathcal{H}$, we have

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq p} \mu(A_i) \text{Bocce-osc}(f; A_i) < \varepsilon.$$

¹⁴See Diestel and Uhl Jr (1978) and Hille and Phillips (1996) for further details on Böchner spaces.

¹⁵Here \mathcal{X}^* denotes the dual space of \mathcal{X} .

¹⁶Suppose that the Banach space \mathcal{X} is reflexive. Then for $1 \leq p < \infty$, the dual of $\mathcal{L}^p(\tilde{\mu}, \mathcal{X})$ is identified by $\mathcal{L}^q(\tilde{\mu}, \mathcal{X}^*)$, where $p^{-1} + q^{-1} = 1$. That is, $\mathcal{L}^p(\tilde{\mu}, \mathcal{X})^* \cong \mathcal{L}^q(\tilde{\mu}, \mathcal{X}^*)$, for $1 \leq p < \infty$. See Diestel and Uhl Jr (1978) for a complete exposition on weak topology on Böchner spaces.

A.2 PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.1

To prove the proposition, we resort to the following theorem.

Theorem A.1 (Pettis's Measurability Theorem (Diestel and Uhl Jr (1978))). *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ be a probability space and let \mathcal{X} be a Banach space. A function $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is μ -measurable if and only if*

- (i) *f is μ -essentially separable valued, that is, there exists $E \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\mu(E) = 0$ and such that $f(\Omega \setminus E)$ is (norm) separable subset of \mathcal{X} , and*
- (ii) *f is weakly μ -measurable.*

We now proceed with the proof of the proposition. We apply Theorem A.1 with $\Omega = \Theta$, $\mu = \xi$, and $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^n$. To show that the mapping $\sigma \mapsto \beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)$ is well-defined, we need to show that for every $\sigma \in \Sigma$, $\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma) \in \Sigma$. In other words, we need to show that $\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)$ is ξ -measurable. We thereby verify the conditions of Theorem A.1. Note that by definition, $\beta(\sigma) : \Theta \rightarrow \Delta(S)$. Since $\Delta(S)$ is compact, it is separable. This verifies condition (i). To verify condition (ii), fix $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We need to show that the map $\mathbf{u}[\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)] : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by $\mathbf{u}[\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)](\theta) := \langle \mathbf{u}, \beta_\varepsilon[\sigma](\theta) \rangle$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$ is weakly ξ -measurable. Since v is a strongly convex function, we it follows that $\beta_\varepsilon[\sigma](\theta) = \nabla v_\varepsilon^*(\mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta))$, in which case we have

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, \beta_\varepsilon[\sigma](\theta) \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}, \nabla v_\varepsilon^*(\mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta)) \rangle, \quad \text{for all } \theta \in \Theta.$$

Also since \mathcal{G} is a Bayesian population game, it follows from the definition that the map $\theta \mapsto \mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta)$ is measurable. Also, it follows from Rockafellar (1970) that ∇v_ε^* is $1/\gamma\varepsilon$ -Lipschitz (hence continuous). Therefore the map $\theta \mapsto \nabla v_\varepsilon^*(\mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta))$ is measurable. As a result, by simple function approximation theorem, it follows that the map $\theta \mapsto \mathbf{u}[\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)](\theta)$ is weakly ξ -measurable. Since $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is arbitrary, condition (ii) is verified. This concludes the proof of Proposition A.1.

A.3 PROOF OF THEOREM 3.1

The proof of Theorem 3.1 is an application of Brouwer-Schauder-Tychonoff fixed point theorem (see Aliprantis and Border (2013)) for details). We provide the details for completeness.

Theorem A.2 (Brouwer-Schauder-Tychonoff FPT). *Let \mathcal{V} be a non-empty compact convex subset of a locally convex Hausdorff space, and let $f : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ be a continuous function. Then the set of fixed points of f is compact and nonempty.*

In order to apply Theorem A.2, recall from Subsection A.1 that the space of integrable signed Bayesian strategies $\widehat{\Sigma}$ is identified by the Böchner space $\mathcal{L}^1(\Theta, \xi, \mathbb{R}^n)$. Since $\widehat{\Sigma}$ is endowed with the weak topology, it follows from Kesavan (2009) that it is a Hausdorff topological space. It also follows from the definition that $\widehat{\Sigma}$ is locally convex. Therefore, under the weak topology, the space of integrable signed Bayesian strategies is a locally convex Hausdorff topological space. We now proceed to show that the space of Bayesian strategies Σ is compact under the weak topology. The fact that Σ is convex is obvious.

Lemma A.1. *The space of Bayesian strategies Σ is compact under the weak topology.*

Proof. The proof of Lemma A.1 is an application of Dunford's Theorem (see Diestel and Uhl Jr (1978) for details) which characterizes relatively weakly compact subsets of $\mathcal{L}^1(\Theta, \xi, \mathbb{R}^n)$.

Theorem A.3 (Dunford's Theorem (Diestel and Uhl Jr (1978))). *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ be a finite measure space and \mathcal{X} be a Banach space such that both \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{X}^* satisfy the Radon-Nikodym property.¹⁷ A subset \mathcal{K} of $\mathcal{L}^1(\mu, \mathcal{X})$ is relatively weakly compact if*

- (i) *the subset \mathcal{K} is bounded,*
- (ii) *the subset \mathcal{K} is uniformly integrable, and*
- (iii) *for each $E \in \mathcal{A}$, the set $\left\{ \int_E f(\omega) d\mu(d\omega) : f \in \mathcal{K} \right\}$ is relatively weakly compact.*

We apply Theorem A.3 with $\Omega = \Theta$, $\mu = \xi$, $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^n$, and $\mathcal{K} = \Sigma$. We need to show that the space of Bayesian strategies Σ satisfies the conditions stated in Theorem A.3. Note that $\|\sigma(\theta)\| \leq \sqrt{n}$, for all $\theta \in \Theta$. Therefore, we have

$$\|\|\sigma\|\| = \int_{\Theta} \|\sigma(\theta)\| \xi(d\theta) \leq \sqrt{n},$$

which in particular implies that $\sup_{\sigma \in \Sigma} \|\|\sigma\|\| \leq \sqrt{n}$. Therefore the subset Σ is bounded. The fact that Σ is uniformly integrable follows since every Bayesian strategy $\sigma \in \Sigma$ is uniformly bounded by \sqrt{n} , for every $\theta \in \Theta$, in which case we have

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\sigma \in \Sigma} \int_{\|\sigma\| > \varepsilon} \|\sigma(\theta)\| \xi(d\theta) \leq \sqrt{n} \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty} \xi(\|\sigma\| > \varepsilon) = 0.$$

¹⁷See Diestel and Uhl Jr (1978), Chap III for the definition of Radon-Nikodym property. It is also known that if \mathcal{X} is a reflexive Banach space, then \mathcal{X} has the Radon-Nikodym property.

Finally we verify condition (iii) of Theorem A.3. To this end, let $E \in \mathcal{B}(\Theta)$. Consider the set

$$\mathcal{I}_E := \left\{ \int_E \sigma(\theta) \xi(d\theta) : \sigma \in \Sigma \right\}.$$

The fact that $\Delta(S)$ is a compact convex subset of \mathbb{R}^n and that $\text{Range}(\sigma) \subseteq \Delta(S)$ for all $\sigma \in \Sigma$, together imply that \mathcal{I}_E is relatively compact. Since E is arbitrary, condition (iii) of Theorem A.3 is satisfied. This proves that Σ is relatively compact under the weak topology. However since Σ is itself closed under the weak topology, it is compact. This concludes the proof of lemma A.1. \blacksquare

To conclude the proof of Theorem 3.1, we need to show that the mapping $\sigma \mapsto \beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)$ is continuous in the weak topology. We show this in the following lemma.

Lemma A.2. *The mapping $\sigma \mapsto \beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)$ is continuous in the weak topology.*

Proof. To prove the lemma, consider a sequence $(\sigma_n)_{n \geq 1} \subseteq \Sigma$, such that $\sigma_n \rightarrow^w \sigma$. We need to show that $\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma_n) \rightarrow^w \beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)$. Since the regularizer is a γ -strongly convex function and \mathcal{G} is a weakly continuous Bayesian population game, there exists $\tilde{\Theta} \subseteq \Theta$ with $\xi(\tilde{\Theta}) = 1$ such that for every fixed $\theta \in \tilde{\Theta}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\beta_\varepsilon[\sigma_n](\theta) - \beta_\varepsilon[\sigma](\theta)\| &= \|\nabla_{V_\varepsilon^*}(\mathcal{G}(\sigma_n, \theta)) - \nabla_{V_\varepsilon^*}(\mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta))\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon\gamma} \|\mathcal{G}(\sigma_n, \theta) - \mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta)\| \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the fact that $\beta_\varepsilon[\sigma_n](\theta) \rightarrow \beta_\varepsilon[\sigma](\theta)$ for every $\theta \in \tilde{\Theta}$. Now let $g \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(\Theta, \xi, \mathbb{R}^{n*})$. This implies that $g(\theta)$ is a bounded linear functional from \mathbb{R}^n to \mathbb{R} for every $\theta \in \Theta$. Therefore, for every $\theta \in \Theta$, we have $g[\theta](x_n) \rightarrow g[\theta](x)$, whenever $x_n \rightarrow x$. Since $\beta_\varepsilon[\sigma_n](\theta) \rightarrow \beta_\varepsilon[\sigma](\theta)$ for every $\theta \in \tilde{\Theta}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\tilde{\Theta}} \langle \beta_\varepsilon(\sigma_n), g \rangle(\theta) \xi(d\theta) &= \int_{\tilde{\Theta}} g(\theta) (\beta_\varepsilon[\sigma_n](\theta)) \xi(d\theta) \\ &\rightarrow \int_{\tilde{\Theta}} g(\theta) (\beta_\varepsilon[\sigma](\theta)) \xi(d\theta) \\ &= \int_{\tilde{\Theta}} \langle \beta_\varepsilon(\sigma), g \rangle(\theta) \xi(d\theta). \end{aligned}$$

This proves that the mapping $\sigma \mapsto \beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)$ is continuous in the weak topology on Σ which completes the proof of Lemma A.2. \blacksquare

Since Σ is a non empty compact convex subset of $\widehat{\Sigma}$ and β_ε is a continuous map, the conditions of Theorem A.2 are satisfied and the existence of a fixed point is established. This concludes the proof of Theorem 3.1.

A.4 PROOF OF COROLLARY 3.1

Proof. In order to prove the corollary, it is enough to show that the aggregate Bayesian population game \mathcal{G} is weakly continuous. Note that from the definition of \mathcal{G} it is enough to show that \mathcal{E} is continuous. Let $\sigma_n \rightarrow \sigma$. We show that $\mathcal{E}(\sigma_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(\sigma)$. To this end, fix $i \in S$. Define the projection map $\pi_i : \mathcal{C}(\Delta; \mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n*}$, such that for every $\theta \in \mathcal{C}(\Delta; \mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$\pi_i[\theta](x) := x_i, \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Note that $\pi_i \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(\mathcal{C}(\Delta; \mathbb{R}^n), \xi, \mathbb{R}^{n*})$ for all $i \in S$. Since $\sigma_n \rightarrow^w \sigma$, we have from the definition of weak topology that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^i(\sigma_n) &= \int_{\Theta} \sigma_n^i(\theta) \xi(d\theta) \\ &= \int_{\Theta} \pi_i(\theta)(\sigma_n(\theta)) \xi(d\theta) \\ &= \int_{\Theta} \langle \sigma_n, \pi_i \rangle(\theta) \xi(d\theta) \\ &\rightarrow \int_{\Theta} \langle \sigma, \pi_i \rangle(\theta) \xi(d\theta) \\ &= \int_{\Theta} \pi_i(\theta)(\sigma(\theta)) \xi(d\theta) \\ &= \int_{\Theta} \sigma^i(\theta) \xi(d\theta) \\ &= \mathcal{E}^i(\sigma). \end{aligned}$$

This proves that $\mathcal{E}(\sigma_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(\sigma)$. Since $\theta \in \mathcal{C}(\Delta; \mathbb{R}^n)$ is continuous, this concludes the proof of Corollary 3.1. \blacksquare

A.5 PROOF OF COROLLARY 3.2

- (i) We need to show that the subset $\mathcal{C}_{\text{mat}}^F(\Delta; \mathbb{R}^n)$ has compact closure in $\mathcal{C}(\Delta; \mathbb{R}^n)$ under the sup-norm metric for every compact set $F \subseteq \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$. We show that $\mathcal{C}_{\text{mat}}^F(\Delta; \mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfies the conditions of Ascoli's theorem.

Theorem A.4 (Ascoli's Theorem). *Let X be a topological space, and let (Y, d_Y) be a metric space. Give $\mathcal{C}(X, Y)$ the topology of compact convergence.¹⁸ Let $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \mathcal{C}(X, Y)$ satisfy the following two conditions:*

- (i) \mathcal{J} is equicontinuous under d_Y .
- (ii) $\mathcal{J}_x := \{j(x) : j \in \mathcal{J}\}$ has a compact closure in Y for all $x \in X$.

Then \mathcal{J} is contained in some compact subspace of $\mathcal{C}(X, Y)$.

We denote the matrix game associated to a population game $\theta \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{mat}}^F(\Delta; \mathbb{R}^n)$ by A_θ . Since $F \subseteq \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$ is compact, there exists $M > 0$, such that

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{mat}}^F(\Delta; \mathbb{R}^n)} \|A_\theta\| \leq M.$$

To verify condition (i) of Theorem A.4, fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Consider a population game $\theta \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{mat}}^F(\Delta; \mathbb{R}^n)$, with the associated matrix game A_θ . Since θ is continuous, there exists $\delta = \varepsilon/M > 0$, such that

$$\|\theta(\mathbf{x}) - \theta(\mathbf{y})\| = \|A_\theta \mathbf{x} - A_\theta \mathbf{y}\| \leq \|A_\theta\| \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{M} \|A_\theta\|, \quad \text{whenever } \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| \leq \delta = \frac{\varepsilon}{M}.$$

This implies that

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{mat}}^F(\Delta; \mathbb{R}^n)} \|\theta(\mathbf{x}) - \theta(\mathbf{y})\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{M} \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{mat}}^F(\Delta; \mathbb{R}^n)} \|A_\theta\| \leq \varepsilon, \quad \text{whenever } \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| \leq \delta = \frac{\varepsilon}{M}.$$

This proves that $\mathcal{C}_{\text{mat}}^F(\Delta; \mathbb{R}^n)$ is equicontinuous. To verify condition (ii) of Theorem A.4, fix $\mathbf{x} \in \Delta(S)$. Define

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{x}} := \{\theta(\mathbf{x}) : \theta \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{mat}}^F(\Delta; \mathbb{R}^n)\}.$$

Since F is compact, we have that $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{x}}$ has compact closure in \mathbb{R}^n . Since, $\mathbf{x} \in \Delta(S)$ is arbitrary, condition (ii) of Theorem A.4 is satisfied. Therefore $\mathcal{C}_{\text{mat}}^F(\Delta; \mathbb{R}^n)$ has compact closure under the sup-norm, concluding the proof of part (i) of Corollary 3.2.

- (ii) The proof of part (ii) of Corollary 3.2 follows from part (i) of Corollary 3.2 in conjunction with Theorem 3.1.

A.6 PROOF OF COROLLARY 4.1

To prove part (i) of the corollary, we need to show that the subset $\text{Lip}_\alpha(\Delta; K)$ is an equicontinuous family and closed under the sup-norm for every α . The fact that $\text{Lip}_\alpha(\Delta; K)$ is equicontinuous is immediate, since the family contains uniformly α -Lipschitz functions. We now show that $\text{Lip}_\alpha(\Delta; K)$ is closed under $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ for every $\alpha > 0$. To this end, fix $\alpha > 0$ and consider a sequence $(\theta_n)_{n \geq 1} \subseteq \text{Lip}_\alpha(\Delta; K)$ such that $\|\theta_n - \theta\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$. We need to show that $\theta \in \text{Lip}_\alpha(\Delta; K)$. Since $\theta_n \in \text{Lip}_\alpha(\Delta; K)$ for all $n \geq 1$, we have that

$$\|\theta_n(\mathbf{x}) - \theta_n(\mathbf{y})\| \leq \alpha \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|, \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \Delta(S). \quad (10)$$

Since $\|\theta_n - \theta\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$, we have that $\|\theta_n(\mathbf{x}) - \theta(\mathbf{x})\| \rightarrow 0$, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \Delta(S)$, which in turn implies that $\theta_n(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow \theta(\mathbf{x})$, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \Delta(S)$. Taking limits on both sides of (10), we have that

$$\|\theta(\mathbf{x}) - \theta(\mathbf{y})\| \leq \alpha \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|, \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \Delta(S).$$

This proves that θ is a α -Lipschitz population game. Therefore, $\theta \in \text{Lip}_\alpha(\Delta; K)$. This proves that $\text{Lip}_\alpha(\Delta; K)$ is compact in $\mathcal{C}(\Delta; \mathbb{R}^n)$. The proof of part (ii) of the corollary we need to show that game \mathcal{G} is a strongly Lipschitz. Fix $\sigma, \rho \in \Sigma$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta) - \mathcal{G}(\rho, \theta)\| &= \|\theta(\mathcal{E}(\sigma)) - \theta(\mathcal{E}(\rho))\| \\ &\leq \alpha \|\mathcal{E}(\sigma) - \mathcal{E}(\rho)\| \\ &\leq \alpha \|\sigma - \rho\|. \end{aligned}$$

By the assumption of the corollary, $\xi(\text{closure}(\text{Lip}_\alpha(\Delta; K))) = 1$. Therefore it follows from the above steps that \mathcal{G} is a strongly Lipschitz Bayesian population game, and hence the conclusions of Theorem 4.1 hold.

This concludes the proof of Corollary 4.1.

¹⁸Here $\mathcal{C}(X, Y)$ denotes the collection of all continuous functions from X to Y .

A.7 PROOF OF THEOREM 4.1

We use the infinite dimensional Picard-Lindeloff Theorem (see [Zeidler \(1986\)](#) for details) to prove [Theorem 4.1](#).

Theorem A.5 (Picard-Lindelöf Theorem, [Zeidler \(1986\)](#)). *Let \mathcal{Y} be a Banach space. Let $y_0 \in \mathcal{Y}, t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, and*

$$\mathcal{Q}_b := \{(t, y) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{Y} \mid |t - t_0| \leq a \text{ and } \|y - y_0\| \leq b\}$$

for fixed $a, b > 0$. Suppose $f : \mathcal{Q}_b \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is continuous and that

$$\|f(t, x) - f(t, y)\| \leq L\|x - y\| \text{ for all } (t, x), (t, y) \in \mathcal{Q}_b, \text{ and}$$

$$\|f(t, x)\| < M \text{ for all } (t, x) \in \mathcal{Q}_b$$

where $L \geq 0$ and $M > 0$ are fixed. Choose c such that $0 < c < a$ and $Mc < b$. Then the initial value problem

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(t, x(t)), \quad x(t_0) = y_0,$$

where $x : [t_0 - c, t_0 + c] \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$, has exactly one continuously differentiable solution on the interval $[t_0 - c, t_0 + c]$.

Now we proceed with the proof of [Theorem 4.1](#). To prove [Theorem 4.1](#), it is by [Theorem A.5](#) enough to show that the mapping $\sigma \mapsto \beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)$ is Lipschitz continuous with respect to the strong topology on Σ . We show this in the following lemma.

Lemma A.3. *The mapping $\sigma \mapsto \beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)$ is Lipschitz continuous with respect to the strong norm on Σ .*

Proof. To prove the lemma, we need to show that there exists a constant $\kappa > 0$, such that

$$\|\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma) - \beta_\varepsilon(\rho)\| \leq \bar{\kappa}\|\sigma - \rho\|, \quad \text{for all } \sigma, \rho \in \Sigma. \quad (11)$$

Fix $\sigma, \rho \in \Sigma$. By (2) and the definition of strong norm, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma) - \beta_\varepsilon(\rho)\| &= \int_{\Theta} \|\beta_\varepsilon[\sigma](\theta) - \beta_\varepsilon[\rho](\theta)\| \xi(d\theta) \\ &= \int_{\Theta} \|\nabla_{v_\varepsilon^*}(\mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta)) - \nabla_{v_\varepsilon^*}(\mathcal{G}(\rho, \theta))\| \xi(d\theta) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon\gamma} \int_{\Theta} \|\mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta) - \mathcal{G}(\rho, \theta)\| \xi(d\theta) \\ &\leq \frac{\kappa}{\varepsilon\gamma} \|\sigma - \rho\|. \end{aligned}$$

The second last inequality occurs since $\nabla_{v_\varepsilon^*}$ is $(\varepsilon\gamma)^{-1}$ -Lipschitz, and the last inequality occurs since the Bayesian population game \mathcal{G} is strongly Lipschitz. Finally we have that

$$\|\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma) - \beta_\varepsilon(\rho)\| \leq \kappa\|\sigma - \rho\|, \quad \text{for all } \sigma, \rho \in \Sigma.$$

Therefore (11) is satisfied with $\bar{\kappa} = \frac{\kappa}{\varepsilon\gamma}$. This completes the proof of [Lemma A.3](#).

We now apply Grönwall's Lemma (see [Zeidler \(1986\)](#) for details) to prove the continuity of the semiflow, that is, part (ii) of [Theorem 4.1](#). We state the lemma below.

Lemma A.4 (Grönwall's Lemma, [Zeidler \(1986\)](#)). *Let $u, v : [t_0 - a, t_0 + a] \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ be maps into the subspace \mathcal{V} of a Banach space \mathcal{Y} . Suppose $f : [t_0 - a, t_0 + a] \times \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is continuous and Lipschitz continuous with respect to u , that is,*

$$\|f(t, u) - f(t, v)\|_{\mathcal{Y}} \leq L\|u - v\|_{\mathcal{Y}} \text{ for all } t \in [t_0 - a, t_0 + a] \text{ and } u, v \in \mathcal{V} \text{ and fixed } L > 0.$$

Then $\|u(t) - v(t)\|_{\mathcal{Y}} \leq e^{L|t-t_0|}\|u(0) - v(0)\|$ for all $t \in [t_0 - a, t_0 + a]$.

We apply [Lemma A.4](#) with $\mathcal{Y} = \widehat{\Sigma}$, $\mathcal{V} = \Sigma$, and $f = \beta_\eta$. By [Lemma A.3](#), the conditions of [Lemma A.4](#) are satisfied. Therefore, there exists $k > 0$ such that for any two solutions $(\sigma_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and $(\tilde{\sigma}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ to the Generalized Dynamic with initial conditions σ_0 and $\tilde{\sigma}_0$, respectively, we have $\|\sigma_t - \tilde{\sigma}_t\| \leq e^{kt}\|\sigma_0 - \tilde{\sigma}_0\|$. This establishes continuity of the semiflow of the Generalized Dynamic. This concludes the proof of [Theorem 4.1](#).

A.8 PROOF OF THEOREM 5.1

To prove part (i) of the theorem, we require the following lemma ([Balder et al. \(1994\)](#)).

Lemma A.5. *A subset \mathcal{K} of $\mathcal{L}^1(\mu, \mathcal{X})$ is relatively norm compact if and only if the following conditions are satisfied.*

(i) *The subset \mathcal{K} is relatively weakly compact.*

(ii) *The subset \mathcal{K} satisfies small Bocce oscillation.*

(iii) *The subset $\{\text{avg}(f; A) : f \in \mathcal{K}\}$ is relatively norm compact in \mathcal{X} , for every $A \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$, such that $\mu(A) > 0$.*

To verify condition (i) of Lemma A.5, note that Σ_α is a subset of Σ . Therefore, the fact that Σ is relatively weakly compact implies that Σ_α is also relatively weakly compact.

We now proceed to verify condition (ii) of Lemma A.5, that is, we need to show that Σ_α satisfies small Bocce oscillation. To this end, fix $\eta > 0$. Since Σ_α is a family of Bayesian strategies which are uniformly α -Lipschitz on Ξ , it follows that Σ_α is a family of equicontinuous Bayesian strategies on Ξ . Therefore, by the definition, there exists $\delta > 0$, such that $\theta, \bar{\theta} \in \Xi$ and $\|\theta - \bar{\theta}\| < \delta$ imply that

$$\|\sigma(\theta) - \sigma(\bar{\theta})\| < \eta, \quad \text{for all } \sigma \in \Sigma_\alpha. \quad (12)$$

Fix $\theta \in \Xi$, and let $B(\theta; \delta)$ denote the open ball of radius δ about θ . Then, for every $\sigma \in \Sigma_\alpha$, we have that $\|\sigma(\theta) - \sigma(\bar{\theta})\| < \eta$, for all $\bar{\theta} \in B(\theta; \delta)$. We now proceed to show that $\text{Bocce-osc}(\sigma, B(\theta; \delta)) < \eta$, for every $\sigma \in \Sigma_\alpha$. To this end, fix $\sigma \in \Sigma_\alpha$. Note that for every $\bar{\theta} \in B(\theta; \delta)$, we have $\|\sigma(\theta) - \sigma(\bar{\theta})\| < \eta$. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sigma(\theta) - \text{avg}(\sigma, B(\theta; \delta))\| &= \frac{1}{\xi(B(\theta; \delta))} \left\| \int_{B(\theta; \delta)} \sigma(\theta) \xi(d\bar{\theta}) - \int_{B(\theta; \delta)} \sigma(\bar{\theta}) \xi(d\bar{\theta}) \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\xi(B(\theta; \delta))} \int_{B(\theta; \delta)} \|\sigma(\theta) - \sigma(\bar{\theta})\| \xi(d\bar{\theta}) \\ &< \eta. \end{aligned}$$

This implies $\text{Bocce-osc}(\sigma, B(\theta; \delta)) < \eta$. Since Σ_α is a family of equicontinuous Bayesian strategies on Ξ , we have from (12), that

$$\text{Bocce-osc}(\sigma; B(\theta; \delta)) < \eta, \quad \text{for all } \sigma \in \Sigma_\alpha.$$

Note that $(B(\theta; \delta))_{\theta \in \Theta}$ is an open cover of Θ . Since Ξ is compact, it follows that there exist $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_p \in \Xi$, such that $\Xi \subseteq \cup_{1 \leq i \leq p} B(\theta_i; \delta)$. Suppose that the collection $(B(\theta_i; \delta))_{1 \leq i \leq p}$ is disjoint. Then,

$$\{B(\theta_i; \delta) : 1 \leq i \leq p\} \cup (\Theta \setminus \Xi)$$

forms a finite measurable partition of Θ . Now, suppose that the collection $(B(\theta_i; \delta))_{1 \leq i \leq p}$ is not disjoint. Then we disjointify the collection and extract a collection $(G(\theta_i; \delta))_{1 \leq i \leq p}$ which forms a measurable partition of Θ , in which case

$$\{G(\theta_i; \delta) : 1 \leq i \leq p\} \cup (\Theta \setminus \Xi)$$

forms a measurable partition of Θ . The fact that the elements of the new collection $(G(\theta_i; \delta))_{1 \leq i \leq p}$ are measurable subsets follows since both open sets and closed sets are measurable, and the Borel sigma-algebra is closed under intersection of finitely many open and closed sets. Therefore we finally have that

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq p} \xi(G(\theta_i; \delta)) \text{Bocce-osc}(\sigma; G(\theta_i; \delta)) < \eta.$$

This proves that Σ_α has small Bocce oscillation thereby verifying condition (ii) of Lemma A.5.

Finally we verify condition (iii) of Lemma A.5. Fix $A \in \mathcal{B}(\Theta)$, such that $\xi(A) > 0$. By the definition of Bayesian strategies, we have that $\mathcal{T}_\alpha(A) := \{\text{avg}(\sigma; A) : \sigma \in \Sigma_\alpha\} \subseteq \Delta(\mathcal{S})$. Since $\Delta(\mathcal{S})$ is compact in the Euclidian topology, we have that $\mathcal{T}_\alpha(A)$ is relatively norm compact in \mathbb{R}^n . Since $A \in \mathcal{B}(\Theta)$ is arbitrary, Condition (iii) of Lemma A.5 is satisfied. This concludes the proof of part (i) of Theorem 5.1.

We now proceed to prove part (ii) of Theorem 5.1. We need to show that Σ_α is forward invariant under the RBBR learning dynamic, whenever, $\alpha \geq (\varepsilon\gamma)^{-1}$. From [Lahkar and Riedel \(2015\)](#), it is enough to show that $\sigma \in \Sigma_\alpha$ implies that $\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma) \in \Sigma_\alpha$. Fix $\sigma \in \Sigma_\alpha$, that is, σ is an α -Lipschitz Bayesian strategy. We need to show that $\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)$ is α -Lipschitz Bayesian strategy. Fix $\theta, \bar{\theta} \in \Theta$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\beta_\varepsilon[\sigma](\theta) - \beta_\varepsilon[\sigma](\bar{\theta})\| &= \|\nabla_{v_\varepsilon}^*(\mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta)) - \nabla_{v_\varepsilon}^*(\mathcal{G}(\sigma, \bar{\theta}))\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon\gamma} \|\mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta) - \mathcal{G}(\sigma, \bar{\theta})\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon\gamma} d_\Theta(\theta, \bar{\theta}) \\ &\leq \alpha d_\Theta(\theta, \bar{\theta}). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the fact that $\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)$ is α -Lipschitz, and hence $\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma) \in \Sigma_\alpha$. Since $\sigma \in \Sigma_\alpha$ is arbitrary, we have that Σ_α is forward invariant. This completes the proof of part (ii) of Theorem 5.1.

A.9 PROOF OF THEOREM 5.2

We first observe that by Theorem 5.1, the subset $\Sigma_M^\alpha[\Xi]$ is norm compact and forward invariant under the RBBR learning dynamic. Thus, in order to prove the theorem, we need to show the Bayesian entropy adjusted potential function $\tilde{\varphi}_M^\alpha$ increases along every solution trajectory to the regularized Bayesian best response learning dynamic

which originates in $\Sigma_M^\alpha[\Xi]$. . Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\tilde{\varphi}}(\sigma) &= \dot{\varphi}(\sigma) - \dot{\tilde{v}}(\sigma) \\
&= D\varphi[\sigma](\dot{\sigma}) - d\tilde{v}[\sigma](\dot{\sigma}) \\
&= \int_{\Theta} \langle \dot{\sigma}, \nabla^F \varphi(\sigma) \rangle(\theta) \xi(d\theta) - \int_{\Theta} \langle \dot{\sigma}, \nabla^G \tilde{v}(\sigma) \rangle(\theta) \xi(d\theta) \\
&= \int_{\Theta} \nabla^F \varphi[\sigma](\theta)(\dot{\sigma}(\theta)) \xi(d\theta) - \int_{\Theta} \nabla^G \tilde{v}[\sigma](\theta)(\dot{\sigma}(\theta)) \xi(d\theta) \\
&= \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla^F \varphi[\sigma](\theta), \dot{\sigma}(\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta) - \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla^G \tilde{v}[\sigma](\theta), \dot{\sigma}(\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta) \\
&= \int_{\Theta} \langle \mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta), \dot{\sigma}(\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta) - \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla^G \tilde{v}[\sigma](\theta), \dot{\sigma}(\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta) \\
&= \int_{\Theta} \langle \mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta) - \nabla^G \tilde{v}[\sigma](\theta), \dot{\sigma}(\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta).
\end{aligned}$$

To complete the proof the theorem, we require the following lemma.

Lemma A.6. *For every $\sigma \in \Sigma_M^\alpha$, the following equality holds:*

$$\int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla^G \tilde{v}_\varepsilon[\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)](\theta), \dot{\sigma}(\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta) = \int_{\Theta} \langle \mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta), \dot{\sigma}(\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta).$$

Proof. Fix $\sigma \in \Sigma_M^\alpha$ and $\sigma_0 \in \Sigma_0$. Recall from the definition of \tilde{v} and from its Gâteaux derivative that

$$\tilde{v}_\varepsilon(\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma) + \varepsilon\sigma_0) = \int_{\Theta} v_\varepsilon(\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)(\theta) + \varepsilon\sigma_0(\theta)) \xi(d\theta),$$

and that

$$\tilde{v}_\varepsilon(\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)) = \int_{\Theta} v_\varepsilon(\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)(\theta)) \xi(d\theta).$$

Since $\sigma \in \Sigma_M^\alpha$, we have that $v(\sigma(\theta))$ is bounded ξ -a.s, in which case, we have

$$d\tilde{v}_\varepsilon[\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)](\sigma_0) = \int_{\Theta} dv_\varepsilon(\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)(\theta))(\sigma_0(\theta)) \xi(d\theta).$$

However by the definition of Gâteaux derivative, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Theta} \nabla^G \tilde{v}_\varepsilon[\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)](\theta)(\sigma_0(\theta)) \xi(d\theta) &= \int_{\Theta} \langle \sigma_0(\theta), \nabla^G \tilde{v}_\varepsilon[\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)](\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta) \\
&= \int_{\Theta} dv_\varepsilon(\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)(\theta))(\sigma_0(\theta)) \xi(d\theta) \\
&= \int_{\Theta} \langle \mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta), \sigma_0(\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta).
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. ■

As a result of Lemma A.6, we have the following equality:

$$\int_{\Theta} \langle \mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta) - \nabla^G \tilde{v}[\sigma](\theta), \dot{\sigma}(\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta) = \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla^G \tilde{v}[\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)](\theta) - \nabla^G \tilde{v}[\sigma](\theta), \dot{\sigma}(\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta).$$

Therefore, in order to prove Theorem 5.2, firstly we need to show that

$$\int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla^G \tilde{v}[\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)](\theta) - \nabla^G \tilde{v}[\sigma](\theta), \dot{\sigma}(\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta) \geq 0. \tag{13}$$

Since v is strongly convex (and hence convex), we have that \tilde{v} is also convex. As a result, we have from Rockafellar (1970), that for every $\sigma, \rho \in \Sigma$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{v}(\rho) &\geq \tilde{v}(\sigma) + \int_{\Theta} \langle \rho - \sigma, \nabla^G \tilde{v}(\sigma) \rangle(\theta) \xi(d\theta) \\
&= \tilde{v}(\sigma) + \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla^G \tilde{v}[\sigma](\theta), \rho(\theta) - \sigma(\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta).
\end{aligned}$$

Putting $\rho = \beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)$ in the above inequality we have that

$$\tilde{v}(\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)) \geq \tilde{v}(\sigma) + \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla^G \tilde{v}[\sigma](\theta), \beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)(\theta) - \sigma(\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta). \tag{14}$$

Now interchanging ρ and σ , we have that

$$\tilde{v}(\sigma) \geq \tilde{v}(\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)) + \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla^G \tilde{v}(\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma))(\theta), \beta_\varepsilon[\sigma](\theta) - \sigma(\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta). \quad (15)$$

Combining inequalities (14) and (15) above, we arrive at the required inequality (13).

Now we complete the proof by showing that the solution trajectory to the RBBR dynamic converges to the set of regularized Bayesian equilibria under the strong topology. By assumption of the theorem, it follows from Theorem 5.1 that $\Sigma_M^\alpha[\Xi]$ is norm compact and forward invariant. Also, since the vector field is Lipschitz under the norm $\|\cdot\|$, it follows from Theorem 4.1 that a continuous and unique solution exists, given any initial condition $\sigma_0 \in \Sigma$. It then follows from standard results of dynamical systems theory (see Bhatia and Szegö (2006) for details) that the omega-limit sets of the trajectory $(\sigma_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is non-empty, compact, and connected in the norm topology. Moreover this set is contained in the set of rest points of the RBBR learning dynamic. Hence any element in the omega-limit set is a rest point of the RBBR learning dynamic and hence a regularized Bayesian equilibrium. Also since the entropy adjusted Bayesian potential function is increasing along every solution trajectory, any point in the omega-limit set will be a maximizer of the function. This concludes the proof of Theorem 5.2.

A.10 PROOF OF LEMMA 6.1

The proof of the lemma follows along the lines of Cheung (2014). Fix $\theta \in \Theta$, $\sigma \in \Sigma$, and $\sigma_0 \in \Sigma_0$. Since the slice map $\mathcal{G}_\theta : \widehat{\Sigma} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is C^1 -Fréchet differentiable for ξ -a.e $\theta \in \Theta$, we have

$$\mathcal{G}_\theta(\sigma + \varepsilon \sigma_0) = \mathcal{G}_\theta(\sigma) + D\mathcal{G}_\theta[\sigma](\varepsilon \sigma_0) + \mathbf{o}(\varepsilon \|\sigma_0\|).$$

This implies that

$$\mathcal{G}_\theta(\sigma + \varepsilon \sigma_0) - \mathcal{G}_\theta(\sigma) = D\mathcal{G}_\theta[\sigma](\varepsilon \sigma_0) + \mathbf{o}(\varepsilon \|\sigma_0\|).$$

Taking inner product with respect to $\varepsilon \sigma_0(\theta)$ on both sides of the above equation and integrating with respect to ξ , we have

$$\int_{\Theta} \langle \mathcal{G}_\theta(\sigma + \varepsilon \sigma_0) - \mathcal{G}_\theta(\sigma), \varepsilon \sigma_0(\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta) = \int_{\Theta} \langle D\mathcal{G}_\theta[\sigma](\varepsilon \sigma_0), \sigma_0(\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta) + \mathbf{o}(\varepsilon^2 \|\sigma_0\|^2).$$

Since \mathcal{G} is a negative semidefinite game, we have

$$\varepsilon^2 \int_{\Theta} \langle D\mathcal{G}_\theta[\sigma](\sigma_0), \sigma_0(\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta) + \mathbf{o}(\varepsilon^2 \|\sigma_0\|^2) \leq 0.$$

Since ε is arbitrary, we have by dividing both sides of the above inequality by ε^2 and allowing $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, that

$$\int_{\Theta} \langle D\mathcal{G}_\theta[\sigma](\sigma_0), \sigma_0(\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta) \leq 0.$$

This proves that \mathcal{G} satisfies self defeating externalities if and only if \mathcal{G} is a negative semidefinite game, which concludes the proof of Lemma 6.1.

A.11 PROOF OF THEOREM 6.1

Similar to the proof of Theorem 5.2, we need to show that the Lyapunov function $\psi_{M,\varepsilon}^\alpha$ decreases along every solution trajectory to the RBBR learning dynamic which originates in $\Sigma_M^\alpha[\Xi]$. To this end let us define the following quantities:

- $\psi_\varepsilon^1(\sigma) := \int_{\Theta} \langle \mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta), \beta_\varepsilon[\sigma](\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta)$ for all $\sigma \in \Sigma_M^\alpha[\Xi]$,
- $\psi_\varepsilon^2(\sigma) := \tilde{v}_\varepsilon(\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma))$ for all $\Sigma_M^\alpha[\Xi]$,
- $\psi_\varepsilon^3(\sigma) := \int_{\Theta} \langle \mathcal{G}(\sigma, \theta), \sigma(\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta)$ for all $\Sigma_M^\alpha[\Xi]$, and
- $\psi_\varepsilon^4(\sigma) := \tilde{v}_\varepsilon(\sigma)$ for all $\Sigma_M^\alpha[\Xi]$.

To prove the theorem, it is enough to show that

$$\dot{\psi}_\varepsilon(\sigma) = \dot{\psi}_\varepsilon^1(\sigma) + \dot{\psi}_\varepsilon^2(\sigma) + \dot{\psi}_\varepsilon^3(\sigma) + \dot{\psi}_\varepsilon^4(\sigma) \leq 0.$$

We now compute the derivatives of ψ_ε^i , $i = 1, \dots, 4$ separately. We have

$$D\psi_\varepsilon^1[\sigma](\dot{\sigma}) = \int_{\Theta} \langle D\mathcal{G}_\theta[\sigma](\dot{\sigma}), \beta_\varepsilon[\sigma](\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta) + \int_{\Theta} \langle \mathcal{G}_\theta(\sigma), \dot{\beta}_\varepsilon[\sigma](\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta).$$

Since the regularizer \tilde{v}_ε is Gâteaux differentiable, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} D\psi_\varepsilon^2[\sigma](\dot{\sigma}) &= d\tilde{v}_\varepsilon(\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma))(\dot{\beta}_\varepsilon(\sigma)) \\ &= \int_{\Theta} \langle \dot{\beta}_\varepsilon(\sigma), \nabla^G \tilde{v}_\varepsilon(\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)) \rangle \xi(d\theta) \\ &= \int_{\Theta} \nabla^G \tilde{v}_\varepsilon[\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)](\theta) (\dot{\beta}_\varepsilon[\sigma](\theta)) \xi(d\theta). \end{aligned}$$

For the third term, we have

$$D\psi_\varepsilon^3[\sigma](\dot{\sigma}) = \int_{\Theta} \langle D\mathcal{G}_\theta[\sigma](\dot{\sigma}), \sigma(\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta) + \int_{\Theta} \langle \mathcal{G}_\theta(\sigma), \dot{\sigma}(\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta).$$

Finally for the fourth term we have

$$\begin{aligned} D\psi_\varepsilon^4[\sigma](\dot{\sigma}) &= d\tilde{v}_\varepsilon[\sigma](\dot{\sigma}) \\ &= \int_{\Theta} \langle \dot{\sigma}, \nabla^G \tilde{v}_\varepsilon(\sigma) \rangle \xi(d\theta) \\ &= \int_{\Theta} \nabla^G \tilde{v}_\varepsilon[\sigma](\theta) (\dot{\sigma}(\theta)) \xi(d\theta). \end{aligned}$$

Combining all the four equations above, we have after simplification that

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{M,\varepsilon}^\alpha(\sigma) &= \int_{\Theta} \langle D\mathcal{G}_\theta[\sigma](\dot{\sigma}), \beta_\varepsilon(\theta)(\omega) \rangle \xi(d\theta) + \int_{\Theta} \langle \mathcal{G}_\theta(\sigma), \dot{\beta}_\varepsilon[\sigma](\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta) \\ &\quad - \int_{\Theta} \nabla^G \tilde{v}_\varepsilon[\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)](\theta) (\dot{\beta}_\varepsilon[\sigma](\theta)) \xi(d\theta) - \int_{\Theta} \langle D\mathcal{G}_\theta[\sigma](\dot{\sigma}), \sigma(\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta) \\ &\quad - \int_{\Theta} \langle \mathcal{G}_\theta(\sigma), \dot{\sigma}(\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta) + \int_{\Theta} \nabla^G \tilde{v}_\varepsilon[\sigma](\theta) (\dot{\sigma}(\theta)) \xi(d\theta) \\ &= \int_{\Theta} \langle D\mathcal{G}_\theta[\sigma](\dot{\sigma}), \dot{\sigma}(\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta) + \int_{\Theta} \langle \mathcal{G}_\theta(\sigma), \dot{\beta}_\varepsilon[\sigma](\theta) - \dot{\sigma}(\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta) \\ &\quad - \int_{\Theta} \nabla^G \tilde{v}_\varepsilon[\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)](\theta) (\dot{\beta}_\varepsilon[\sigma](\theta)) \xi(d\theta) + \int_{\Theta} \nabla^G \tilde{v}_\varepsilon[\sigma](\theta) (\dot{\sigma}(\theta)) \xi(d\theta). \end{aligned}$$

Since \mathcal{G} is a Bayesian negative semidefinite game and $\dot{\sigma} \in \Sigma_0$, it follows from Lemma 6.1 that the first term in the RHS of the above equation is less than or equal to zero, that is,

$$\int_{\Theta} \langle D\mathcal{G}_\theta(\sigma)(\dot{\sigma}), \dot{\sigma}(\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta) \leq 0.$$

Using this fact and rearranging the other terms in the RHS of the above equation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{M,\varepsilon}^\alpha(\sigma) &\leq \int_{\Theta} \langle \mathcal{G}_\theta(\sigma) - \nabla^G \tilde{v}_\varepsilon[\beta_\varepsilon(\sigma)](\theta), \dot{\beta}_\varepsilon[\sigma](\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta) \\ &\quad - \int_{\Theta} \langle \mathcal{G}_\theta(\sigma) - \nabla^G \tilde{v}_\varepsilon[\sigma](\theta), \dot{\sigma}(\theta) \rangle \xi(d\theta). \end{aligned}$$

It now follows from Lemma (A.6) that the first term in the RHS of the above inequality is 0. It also follows that the second term in the RHS of the above inequality is non-negative. As a result, we have $\psi_{M,\varepsilon}^\alpha \leq 0$ along every solution which originates in $\Sigma_M^\alpha[\Xi]$. In particular, this implies that the Lyapounov function defined in (9) decreases along every non-stationary solution which originates in $\Sigma_M^\alpha[\Xi]$. By part (i) of Theorem 5.1, we have that $\Sigma_M^\alpha[\Xi]$ is compact under the norm topology on $\hat{\Sigma}$ and $\psi \leq 0$ with equality only at the rest points, it follows from the standard theory of dynamical systems (Bhatia and Szegő (2006)) that the omega-limit of every solution trajectory satisfies $\psi_{M,\varepsilon}^\alpha = 0$, which is the set of all rest points of the RBBR dynamic. We therefore have that every non-stationary solution arising in $\Sigma_M^\alpha[\Xi]$ converges to a regularized Bayesian equilibrium. ■

REFERENCES

- [1] Charalambos D. Aliprantis and Kim C Border. *Infinite Dimensional Analysis: A Hitchhiker's Guide*. Springer-Verlag Berlin and Heidelberg GmbH & Company KG, 2013.
- [2] Erik J Balder, Maria Girardi, and Vincent Jalby. From weak to strong types of L^1_E -convergence by the bocce-criterion. *arXiv preprint math/9402210*, 1994.
- [3] Michel Benaïm and Morris W Hirsch. Mixed equilibria and dynamical systems arising from fictitious play in perturbed games. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 29(1-2):36–72, 1999.

- [4] Nam P Bhatia and George P Szegő. *Dynamical systems: stability theory and applications*, volume 35. Springer, 2006.
- [5] Man-Wah Cheung. Pairwise comparison dynamics for games with continuous strategy space. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 153:344–375, 2014.
- [6] J Diestel and JJ Uhl Jr. Vector measures. *Bull. Am. Math. Soc*, 84(4):681–685, 1978.
- [7] Jeffrey C Ely and William H Sandholm. Evolution in bayesian games i: theory. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 53(1):83–109, 2005.
- [8] Drew Fudenberg and David K. Levine. *The theory of learning in games*, volume 2. MIT press, 1998.
- [9] Amélie Héliou, Matthieu Martin, Panayotis Mertikopoulos, and Thibaud Rahier. Online non-convex optimization with imperfect feedback. *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (Accepted)*, 2020.
- [10] Einar Hille and Ralph Saul Phillips. *Functional analysis and semi-groups*, volume 31. American Mathematical Soc., 1996.
- [11] Josef Hofbauer and Ed Hopkins. Learning in perturbed asymmetric games. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 52(1):133–152, 2005.
- [12] Josef Hofbauer and William H Sandholm. On the global convergence of stochastic fictitious play. *Econometrica*, 70(6):2265–2294, 2002.
- [13] Josef Hofbauer and William H Sandholm. Evolution in games with randomly disturbed payoffs. *Journal of economic theory*, 132(1):47–69, 2007.
- [14] Srinivasan Kesavan. *Functional analysis*, volume 52. Springer, 2009.
- [15] Ratul Lahkar and Frank Riedel. The logit dynamic for games with continuous strategy sets. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 91:268–282, 2015.
- [16] Dov Monderer and Lloyd S Shapley. Potential games. *Games and economic behavior*, 14(1):124–143, 1996.
- [17] R Tyrrell Rockafellar. *Convex analysis*. Number 28. Princeton university press, 1970.
- [18] William H Sandholm. *Population games and evolutionary dynamics*. MIT press, 2010.
- [19] William H Sandholm et al. Evolution in bayesian games ii: Stability of purified equilibria. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 136(1):641–667, 2007.
- [20] Mathias Staudigl. Co-evolutionary dynamics and bayesian interaction games. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 42(1):179–210, 2013.
- [21] E Zeidler. *Nonlinear functional analysis and its applications*, i springer. New York, NY, 1986.
- [22] Dai Zusai. Evolutionary dynamics in heterogeneous populations: a general framework for an arbitrary type distribution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.04897*, 2018.